

A Nuerenberg Trial In U.S.?

Why not hold a "Nuerenberg Trial" in the United States?

By O. E. Edstrom

(Written a few years after the close of World War II.)

Now that a precedent has been set how people shall be treated who attempt to save their country, their homes, their families, and themselves, from being enslaved by the African and Mongolian Jews—why not prescribe the same treatment for those who start wars—those who are the aggressors?

If the charges made by Tyler Kent were not true—why was not the whole affair aired in open court—in the United States, not in England—so the whole world could have been so informed, instead of throwing him into a British prison for seven years—against all International Law?

If true, as must be the case, as there has been no attempt to disprove those serious charges—why was not Roosevelt brought to trial for high treason for planning with Churchill to control the world by betraying us into a second World War for the Jews?

Why was not Roosevelt hailed before the people and charged with treason and murder for ordering the sinking of several German ships, before he succeeded in getting Congress to declare war on Germany?

If, as has now been established by the Jews themselves, it is criminal for an officer to obey orders from his government—why were not all officers who had anything to do with the sinking of German ships, including all politicians in Washington who had anything to do with it, not brought before "a Bar of Justice" and charged with cold-blooded murder?

Why was not Roosevelt, and those who murdered German Scientists in Greenland—Scientists who were there by permission of proper authorities—not charged with wanton murder?

When Roosevelt—eight months before Congress declared war—and while proving himself to be the world's champion liar, sent American troops to Iceland, entirely against the will of the Icelanders, in addition to previously building bunkers for our troops in Ireland and England—did he not commit treason against the American people?

Was not the "confiscation" of Japanese holdings in this country, before Japan had committed one single aggression against the United States; the "order" to "shoot" anything Japanese in the Pacific; the ultimatum to Japan—all so evidently for the purpose of forcing Japan to commit an overt act that no real American will attempt to disprove that deduction? Which brings up this question:

Why was not Roosevelt impeached and tried for treason then? Had he been—World War 2 would never have taken place.

Was the "gift" of 50 American warships to England—after first spending \$50,000,000 of the American taxpayers' money to repair them—anything but treason to the American people?

Was the "gift" of 100 ships to Joe Stalin—after Japan had twice offered to surrender—once before Iwo Jima and Okinawa and again before the Jews committed the world's most fiendish crime—the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki—anything but treason?

Can it be called anything but treason when Roosevelt handed over, during 1942-43-44, \$6,000,000,000 of the American taxpayers' money—without the knowledge of said taxpayers—to the South American countries, as bribes for them to come in and assist the International Jews to take the world over?

If this is not treason, what is it? When Roosevelt, at the booze-swilling party he and Stalin held in Yalta, signed away territories, islands and whole nations to Stalin—properties he had no jurisdiction over—excepting as representative of a nation powerful enough



"And while I am talking to you fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again, your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars."

—Franklin D. Roosevelt
Boston, Oct. 30, 1940

to ride rough-shod over smaller and weaker nations, was that treason? It is reported that 16,000 bottles of booze was downed at that meeting; that FDR swilled 30 to 40 toasts to his bosom, criminal friend, Holy Joe.

Can anyone think of anything more criminal and treasonable than when Ike, with, naturally, Roosevelt's blessing, turned some 10,000,000 Germans over to Russia; about 500,000 each to England and France—as slaves? Remember this: Over three years after the war ended—all of these human beings were still held as slaves, murdered or starved to death. And that is what our sons were sent to Europe for—sent there to be slaughtered while making it possible for the International Jews to murder or enslave the Christians there—people who had the courage to resist the inhuman fiends.

Why are not Ike and the rest of the officers responsible for carrying out Roosevelt's orders charged with the world's greatest and most loathsome slavery?

Why were not Roosevelt, Eisenhower and other brass-hats not charged with treason when they held the United States Army back so the Russians Mongolian Army could take Berlin—after they had caused the slaughter of our sons to make such capture by the Soviets possible?

As long as Ike was Commander in Chief in Europe—why is he not now called on the carpet and accused, as he should be, of being responsible for carrying out the damnable Jew Plan for demoralizing the white race by permitting the American Negro soldiers to take 5,000 white German girls from their homes and keep them in a tunnel for several days, there to rape and abuse them? Why is he not brought to trial now for that fiendish crime?

Why should not Harry Solomon Truman and Henry Morgenthau be tried for treason for turning over the American money-printing plates to Stalin—thereby permitting him to print all the money he needs in Germany—monies the American taxpayer must redeem?

Was it not treason for Roosevelt to turn over Manchuria; half of Korea, and the Karelian Islands to the Soviet Union, so they could be stripped of all the wonderful improvements Japan built in those countries—in addition to making all the people there slaves to the Mongolian Khazars.

Why are not William C. Bullitt, Henry Morgenthau and Major Henry H. Arnold called on to show cause why they should not be held for treason for permitting the French to inspect our plane secrets—secrets which

were supposed to be so important that even Congress was not permitted to find out about them?

Is it not treason to the American people when the Jews can force American officers to wear a Star of David on their caps? This fact so encouraged a Jewish officer that he—sneeringly—told another officer, a Christian: "Certainly, you are fighting for Jews."

Is it not a matter of treason that the American dollar bill is embellished with Jewish Symbols? Why are not those responsible for these crimes hailed into court and charged with treason?

The very fact that the Navy Department "quietly" decorated Navy personnel for their part in the convoy duty, long before Pearl Harbor—should be evidence enough to convict Roosevelt and all high grade brass-hats of committing a treasonable act when convoying such ships—and that such treasonable act plunged the United States into World War 2.

After Attorney General Biddle stated: "The Communist Party believes in, advocates and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States," is it not then a matter of treason to promote those men to officers in the United States Army—where they are in position to effectively betray the country they have sworn to protect?

"General, I can forgive an officer for making a mistake, I can understand that an officer may lose a battle. But if he betrays the security of his country—he should be taken out and shot."

That is not a statement by the writer—it is a quotation from a statement made by Senator Styles Bridges in regard to General Joseph T. McNarney, then Deputy Chief of Staff to General George Marshall, on May 19, 1944, when McNarney ordered "All War Department files dealing with subversive personnel to be destroyed."

Question. Did General Marshall issue those orders to General McNarney? Do you, as an American, consider that order, regardless of who had the "authority" to issue it, patriotic, or do you consider it treasonable?

Why should not Harry Solomon Truman—the only person who had the authority to order the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki; the one who carried out the order—including everyone who had a leading part in committing the world's most horrifying crime of the cold-blooded murder of hundreds of thousands of innocent old men, women and children in those cities—be held for murder in the first degree?

Why are not the United Nations' real objects revealed to the people, so they can judge for themselves if they wish to support what it really stands for—taking the world over for International Jewry?

Why are not the American people told that the atom bomb has been turned over to Communist-controlled Jews? Are they afraid the American people would not stand for such treachery—were they informed of the truth regarding that all-important matter?

—Why not tell the American people that the real reason for betraying the Arabs, by robbing them of their homeland and turning it over to the International Jews, is this:

So the Jews can grab the two greatest treasures in the world—the chemicals in the Dead Sea, and the oil fields—both of which are the richest on earth, wealth which will enable them to buy, bribe and coerce the leaders of most of the nations to sell out to them. When that has become an accomplished fact—they'll set themselves up as Supreme Rulers of the World—as they have said they would, making Palestine the Capital of the World.